

REMARKS

Applicant hereby traverses the current rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein. New claims 21-34 have been provided for consideration. Claims 1-20 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 21-34 are pending in this application.

Rejections of Record

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,206 to Sebastian et al (hereinafter "Sebastian").

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 to Thackston (hereinafter "Thackston").

Claims 3, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian in view of Thackston and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0012007 A1 to Twigg (hereinafter "Twigg").

In response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-19 and provided new claims 21-34 for consideration. No new matter is believed to have been entered with these new claims. Applicant believes that that new claims 21-34 are patentable over the rejections of record as new claim 21 has limitations that are neither taught nor suggested by Sebastian or the combinations of Sebastian with Thackston and Twigg. More specifically, claim 21 defines a method for handling an issue related to a design of product using a computer a system that allows collaboration between a plurality of users. The method comprises storing a question related to the issue, wherein the question is provided by a first user of the plurality of users; storing an answer related to the question, wherein the answer is provided by a second user of the plurality of users; and storing a decision made based on the answer, wherein the decision is made by a third user of the plurality of users. Nothing in Sebastian teaches such a method. Thackston and Twigg are not relied upon as teaching these limitations. Therefore, Applicant asserts that each of claims 21-34

set forth features and limitations not recited by Sebastian nor the combinations of Sebastian with Thackston and Twigg. Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that for the above reasons claims 21-34 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record.

Conclusion

For all the reasons given above, the Applicant submits that the pending claims distinguish over the prior art of record under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that this application is in full condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.


Applicant believes that a fee of \$810.00 is due with this response. Please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10003655-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 29, 2008

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: April 29, 2008

Signature:


(Jay H. Perigo)

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael A. Papalas
Registration No.: 40,381
Attorney for Applicant

(214) 855-8186